

REMARKS

The applicant's comments are preceded by comments of the examiner, shown in bold-face, small type:

3. Claims 1—34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laurence et al. (US 4860352, cited by Applicant, hereinafter also referred as "Laurence") and Schipper et al. (US 574657, cited by Applicant, hereinafter also referred as "Schipper")

4. Regarding claim 1, Laurence teaches a method comprising, in connection with authenticating a client of a network, acquiring information that characterizes the client in a manner that enables a determination about authenticating the client of the network, ... and making an authentication decision based on the information (column 6, line 53 to column 7, line 32, i.e. position encryption which provides authenticating in a satellite network — “the satellite and receivers” teaching “server and clients”)

5. These passages of Laurence do not teach “the information being acquired other than in the form of a digital message that is passed on behalf of the client to the network aliases.”

The applicant agrees that Laurence does not disclose or suggest that feature.

6. Schipper teaches “the information being acquired other than in the form of a digital message that is passed on behalf of the client to the network (column 6, lines 29—45, i.e. putative source handling)” for the motivation of “authenticating source of a message” (column 6, lines 14—18)

7. It would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine the teachings of Laurence with the teachings of Schipper for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to make clear that both empirical information that represents a characterization of a supposed client and information that represents a characterization of an authentic client are received or obtained other than as part of digital messages that are passed to the network.

Schipper teaches away from such an arrangement because, in his system, the augmented data signal formed by the putative source includes information about the source's location (the signals Y, W, and P). This is an entirely different scheme from the one recited in claim 1 which does not rely on characterization information being passed

on behalf of the client. Thus, amended claim 1 was not anticipated by, and could not have been obvious from any combination of Laurence and Schipper.

8. Regarding claims 2—34, such various network and satellite and security handlings are well known in the art for the motivation of safe communication. Such details are referred throughout Laurence and Schipper, such as at the cited passages of Laurence and Schipper.

Without conceding the examiner's position, the applicant notes that dependent claims 2 through 20, and independent claim 33, are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 29 has been amended to incorporate the feature of claim 30, which has been canceled. The feature of mapping locations of a person based on times of receipt of the beacon at multiple stations does not appear to be described in and would not have been obvious from the passages of Laurence and Schipper cited by the examiner. The applicant respectfully asks the examiner to indicate where in those references the generating of such a map was described or how it would have been made obvious. The applicant believes that claim 29 and dependent claims 31 and 32 are patentable.

Claim 34 recites expressing the message as a message signal comprised of a sum based on eigenfunctions and then decomposing the sum into partial sums such that each of the partial sums conveys no meaning relative to the message. This feature does not appear to be present in the cited passages of Laurence and Schipper, and the applicant respectfully asks the examiner to indicate where in those references this feature is described or how it would have allegedly been made obvious. The applicant believes that claim 34 is patentable.

The applicant has amended claim 21 to include the features of claims 23 and 24. The applicant disagrees that there is anything in the cited passages of the Laurence and Schipper references, taken alone or together, that describes or would have made obvious the encrypting of information in a manner based on a physical property of an intended recipient, and decrypting the information on behalf of the recipient based on the physical property. The applicant respectfully requests the examiner to point out where either of the

Applicant : Andrew L. Di Rienzo
Serial No. : 09/560,784
Filed : April 28, 2000
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 11787-002001

references describes or would have made obvious such an encryption and decryption system.

Dependent claims 22 and 25 through 28 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 21.

The fact that the applicant has addressed certain positions of the examiner does not mean the applicant concedes any other positions of the examiner. The fact that the applicant has presented arguments in support of patentability of a claim does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of that claim or other claims. The fact that the applicant has amended a claim does not necessarily mean that the applicant concedes the examiner's basis for rejecting the claim prior to amendment.

Applicant notes that the examiner did not initial the WO 98/57189 PCT reference cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed May 4, 2001. Applicant requests the examiner to initial and return a copy of Form 1449.

Enclosed is a \$475.00 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, reference 11787-002001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/20/4

2/20/4

David L. Feigenbaum
Reg. No. 30,378

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906
20802191.doc